

## **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed December 31, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 17, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Roztocil, et al.* ("Roztocil," U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0044868). Applicant respectfully traverses.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In the present case, not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the Roztocil reference. Applicant discusses the Roztocil reference and Applicant's claims in the following.

#### **A. The Roztocil Disclosure**

Roztocil discloses a production work flow 100 of a "typically production print shop." *Roztocil*, paragraph 0020. The work flow 100 comprises various stages, including job origination 102, job submission 104, job preparation 106, print production 108, and final fulfillment 110. *Roztocil*, Figure 1.

As shown in Figure 1, the print shop includes a computer network 112 that includes computer work stations 114, 116, servers 118, 120, and output devices 122. *Roztocil*, paragraph 0021. A customer can submit a job during job origination 102 by either physically delivering to the print shop one or more documents in hard copy or electronic form or by transmitting the one or more documents to the print shop via the Internet. *Roztocil*, paragraph 0022. After that point, all aspects of the production work flow 100 are performed at the print shop using its network 112. See *Roztocil*, paragraphs 0023-0033.

Included in the production work flow 100 performed at the print shop is what Roztocil calls “user functionality workflow 200.” *Roztocil*, paragraph 0034. That workflow 200 includes a preflight stage 204 that is performed using a workflow management software program that executes on a job preparation workstation 116 at the print shop. *Roztocil*, paragraph 0036. Using that program, operators at the print shop can obtain data about the various output devices 122 of the print shop, including their availability and capabilities. *Roztocil*, paragraph 0045.

As can be appreciated from the above, with the exception of transmitting documents over the Internet to Roztocil’s print shop, no actions of Roztocil’s disclosed production work flow are performed at a customer’s (e.g., designer’s) location.

## **B. Applicant's Claims**

Applicant's independent claim 1 provides as follows:

1. A method of managing workflow in a commercial printing environment including a designer location and a print service provider location, said method comprising:

creating at the designer location a print job to be printed at the print service provider location;

establishing a closed-loop communication link between the designer location and the print service provider location;

the designer location obtaining updated device configuration information from the print service provider location via said closed-loop communication link;

creating a job ticket at the designer location that specifies production devices of the print service provider to be used to process said print job and processing instructions for the print service provider location;

creating a press ready file at the designer location that encompasses both said print job and said job ticket;

submitting said press ready file to the print service provider location via said closed-loop communication link;

processing said print job at the print service provider location; and

transmitting over said closed-loop communication link continuously updated status information to the designer location so as to keep the designer location apprised of a production status of said print job at the print service provider location, said status information including an indication of tasks that have already been performed in relation to the print job and a current task being performed in relation to the print job.

Roztocil fails to teach several of the limitations of claim 1. As a first matter, Roztocil does not teach "the designer location obtaining updated device configuration information from the print service provider location via said closed-loop communication link". Although, Roztocil describes a customer transmitting a print job over the Internet to Roztocil's print shop (Roztocil, paragraph 0022), thereby establishing what may be referred to as a communication link, Roztocil does not indicate that that link is used to provide any device configuration information to the designer location. Instead, as described above, all actions in Roztocil's production work flow 100 with the exception of transmitting the job via the Internet are performed at Roztocil's print shop. Regarding the Examiner's identification of paragraph 0022 and 0023 of the Roztocil disclosure, those paragraphs say nothing of a designer (customer) location obtaining any device configuration information from a print service provider (print shop). As for the Examiner's comments as to pre-printed job tickets, those tickets (i) are filled in by print shop operators and therefore are not provided to the designer/customer, and (ii) are certainly not provided to the designer/customer over any "closed loop communication link".

As a second matter, Roztocil does not teach "creating a job ticket at the designer location that specifies production devices of the print service provider to be used to process said print job and processing instructions for the print service provider location". Again, all actions in Roztocil's production work flow 100 except transmission of a print job over the Internet are performed at Roztocil's print shop. Therefore, no job ticket is created at the designer/customer location. Furthermore, although paragraph 0023 of the Roztocil disclosure, which was cited by the Examiner, describes creation of a job

ticket at the print shop, Roztocil does not indicate that the job ticket specifies the "production devices" that are to process the print job.

As a third matter, Roztocil does not teach "creating a press ready file at the designer location that encompasses both said print job and said job ticket". Although Roztocil describes the creation of a "ready for printer file" that includes a print job and a job ticket, Roztocil explicitly states that that file is created during "job preparation 106," which is performed at Roztocil's print shop by one of the print shop operators. See *Roztocil*, paragraphs 0027 and 0028.

As a fourth matter, Roztocil does not teach anything that even comes close to "transmitting over said closed-loop communication link continuously updated status information to the designer location so as to keep the designer location apprised of a production status of said print job at the print service provider location, said status information including an indication of tasks that have already been performed in relation to the print job and a current task being performed in relation to the print job". Regarding paragraph 0047 of the Roztocil disclosure, which was cited by the Examiner, Roztocil states:

[0047] Finally, the workflow management software provides tools to send the prepared documents and any associated tickets to the production output device for final production. In the preferred embodiments, documents or compound documents can be sent to a production output device by selecting, clicking or dragging the visual representation of the document or compound document to a visual representation of the print server or output device. Alternatively, the user may select an appropriate option from a pull-down menu, pop up dialog box or button palate. The workflow management software supports standard interfaces and

protocols to production output devices and print servers. Further, tools are provided for managing, selecting and monitoring multiple production output devices. These tools provide visual feed back of each of the devices status to the user such as the current job queues.

*Roztocil*, paragraph 0047. As can be appreciated from the above excerpt, *Roztocil* only reference to job status is the following: "tools are provided for managing, selecting and monitoring multiple production output devices. These tools provide visual feed back of each of the devices status to the user such as the current job queues." Notably, *Roztocil* does not state that those "tools" (i) transmit anything over a "closed-loop communication link" established between a designer location and a print service provider location, (ii) transmit "continuously updated status information" to the designer location or anyone else, or (iii) transmit information that indicates which tasks that have already been performed or the current task being performed in relation to the print job.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that *Roztocil* does not in fact anticipate Applicant's independent claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependents are allowable. Applicant further submits that independent claim 11 and its dependents are allowable for similar reasons.

## **II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 9 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Roztocil* in view of *Kemp, et al.* ("Kemp," U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0078160). Applicant respectfully traverses.

As identified above, Roztocil does not teach aspects of Applicant's claims. In that Kemp does not remedy the deficiencies of the Roztocil reference, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 19 are allowable over the Roztocil/Kemp combination for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable over Roztocil.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



---

David Rodack  
Registration No. 47,034